

Serial No. 09/196,338
In reply to Office Action mailed July 25, 2005
Page 9 of 10

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on July 25, 2005. Claims 1, 10, 11 and 25-29 are pending in this application. With this amendment, claims 1, 10, and 11 are amended. Claims 25-29 are unchanged.

The pending claims were rejected under 34 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergh in view of Sumita. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are patentably distinguishable over the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended to include the limitation that "the requesting user's profile is selected from a plurality of the requesting user's profiles, wherein each of the requesting user's profiles corresponds with a unique persona including unique personal information." As described in the specification, the unique personas aggregate profile information into sets that are useful in different contexts (See pages 71 and 72). Examples include a work profile, a home profile, a vacation profile, a profile that restricts reservations with only one airline, and the like. In addition, the independent claims have been amended to include that "each user profile comprises a set of personal information data where in the personal information data includes direct user inputs and information based on the use of the product/service rating information." Accordingly, each persona is created and updated with direct inputs provided from the user regarding the desired persona as well as automatic inputs provided from the use of the system, method or program. The personal information can be directly controlled by the user and the personal information becomes smarter based on the user's statistics (See page 75).

These features are not shown or suggested in the combination of Bergh in view of Sumita. Although Bergh teaches that multiple user profiles can be created with the disclosed system based on user inputs, the reference does not show or suggest that the "proclivities of the user" are automatically updated based on the use of the system. The Bergh system does not collect user statistics based on the use of the system for each profile that can then be used to update the user's proclivities for each profile. Similarly, Sumita also does not show or suggest

Serial No. 09/196,338
In reply to Office Action mailed July 25, 2005
Page 10 of 10

these features. Because the amended features are missing from or not suggested in Bergh and Sumita, the features cannot be found in any proposed combination of the references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amended independent claims 1, 10, and 11, and the dependent claims 25-29, are patentably distinguishable from the combination of Bergh in view of Sumita. Applicants request favorable action and allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all pending claims are now allowable and respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (612) 607-7340.

Should any additional fees be necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit any such fees or overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1901 (Reference 60021-302901).

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Rudolph P. Hoffmann, Reg. No. 38,187
Customer No. 29,838

Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly, LLP
45 South Seventh St., Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1609
Telephone: 612-607-7340
Facsimile: 612-607-7100